arXiv:1611.01435v1 [gr-qc] 4 Nov 2016

A modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld Procedure for Testing the Compatibility of General-Covariant Continuum Physics and General Relativity Theory

W. Muschik*
Institut für Theoretische Physik
Technische Universität Berlin
Hardenbergstr. 36
D-10623 BERLIN, Germany

Abstract Creating a modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations are derived by which a comparison of General-Covariant Continuum Physics with General Relativity Theory becomes possible.

Keywords Modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure · Mathisson-Papapetrou equations · Constitutive properties in General-Covariant Continuum Physics and General Relativity Theory

1 Introduction

The Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure generates a symmetric and divergence-free tensor of second order which serves as a source of Einstein's equations. The original procedure implemented for the special-relativistic case [1, 2] was recently extended to General-Covariant Continuum Physics (GCCP) [3]. The special-relativistic Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure and also the general-covariant one start out with an especially defined combination of spin divergences which together with the symmetric part of the energy-momentum tensor is symmetrized and made divergence-free. Special constraints by performing the procedure do not appear in the special-relativistic case, whereas in the general-covariant case such constraints are generated: the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations which have to be satisfied as necessary conditions for the energy-momentum tensor and the spin tensor of GCCP [3].

Now the question arises whether the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure is unique, or if there exist different combinations of spin divergences for generating symmetric and divergence-free tensors. This question is here investigated for the case of GCCP

*Corresponding author: muschik@physik.tu-berlin.de

by introducing a family of Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedures.

The paper is organized as follows: After this introduction and recalling the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, a family of spin divergences is introduced, implementing a modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure resulting in Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations. These equations decompose into two classes: one class contains the curvature tensor for special family parameters , the other does not. The first class is chosen because we are interested in the effectiveness of the modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure in General Relativity Theory (GRT) with regard to GCCP. Inserting the balance equations of energy-momentum and spin into the necessary Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations, we obtain a system of differential equations for the spin and the metric. Finally, a remark is made about the compatibility of GCCP with GRT with regard to constitutive properties.

2 The Mathisson-Papapetrou equations

First of all, we start out with the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure citing the well known

■ Proposition[3, 4, 5]: The general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure generates a symmetric and divergence-free tensor

$$ {}^{\dagger}\Theta^{ab} \;:=\; T^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\Big[S^{cab} + S^{abc} + S^{bac}\Big]_{;c}, \tag{1} $$

if the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations

$$ \frac{1}{2}S^{cab}{}_{;c} \;=\; T^{[ab]}, \qquad T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big[S^{cab} + S^{abc} + S^{bac}\Big]_{;c;a} \;=\; -\frac{1}{2}R^{b}_{klm}S^{klm} \tag{2} $$

are valid as necessary constraints. ■

Here, T^{ab} is the in general non-symmetric and not divergence-free energy-momentum tensor, S^{cab} the spin tensor and R^{b}_{klm} the curvature tensor. The Mathisson-Papapetrou equations (2) are general-covariant including the special-relativistic case which is characterized by replacing the covariant derivatives by commuting partial ones and by $R^{b}_{klm} \equiv 0$. Subtracting $(2)_1$ from (1) results in

$$ {}^{\dagger}\Theta^{ab} \;=\; T^{(ab)} - \frac{1}{2}\Big[S^{abc} + S^{bac}\Big]_{;c} \;=\; T^{(ab)} - S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c}, \tag{3} $$

a tensor which is symmetric and divergence-free according to (1) and $(2)_2$. Consequently, the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure transforms by use of the spin divergences a not necessary symmetric and divergence-free tensor into such one

$$ T^{ab} \neq T^{ba},\; T^{ab}{}_{;a} \neq 0 \quad \stackrel{BRP}{\longrightarrow} \quad {}^{\dagger}\Theta^{ab} =^{\dagger} \Theta^{ba},\; {}^{\dagger}\Theta^{ab}{}_{;a} = 0, \tag{4} $$

starting out with the definition (1).

The question now arises, whether symmetrizations are possible which do not refer to such ad-hoc setting (1), and by which conditions the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure (4) is characterized. Consequently, we are looking for another possibility than (1) to use spin divergences for a symmetrization of the energy-momentum tensor.

3 A modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld Procedure

3.1 A family of spin divergences

The general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure starts out with the ad-hoc expression (1). We now replace the square bracket in (1) by an ad-hoc family of spin divergences whose family parameters are scalars (λ, μ, ν) implementing a modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. Analogously to (1), we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^{ab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) &:= T^{ab} - \Sigma^{cab}{}_{;c}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) && (5)\\ \Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) &:= \mu S^{cab} + \lambda S^{(ab)c} + \nu S^{[ab]c} \;= \\ &= \mu S^{cab} + \lambda\frac{1}{2}(S^{abc}+S^{bac}) + \nu\frac{1}{2}(S^{abc}-S^{bac}) \;= \\ &= \mu S^{cab} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu)S^{abc} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda-\nu)S^{bac}. && (6) \end{aligned}$$

According to its definition $(6)_1$, the symmetric and anti-symmetric parts of $\Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu)$ are[1]

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{c(ab)}(\lambda) &= \lambda S^{(ab)c}, && (7)\\ \Sigma^{c[ab]}(\mu,\nu) &= \mu S^{cab} + \nu S^{[ab]c}, && (8) \end{aligned}$$

by taking the anti-symmetry of the spin tensor

$$S^{cab} \;=\; -S^{cba} \qquad (9)$$

into account. We obtain from $(6)_3$ by changing $c \leftrightarrow a$ and using (9)

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{acb}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) &= \mu S^{acb} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu)S^{cba} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda-\nu)S^{bca} \;= \\ &= -\mu S^{abc} - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu)S^{cab} - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda-\nu)S^{bac}. && (10) \end{aligned}$$

Addition of $(10)_2$ with $(6)_3$ results in

$$\Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) + \Sigma^{acb}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) = \Big[\mu - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu)\Big]S^{cab} + \Big[\frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu) - \mu\Big]S^{abc}. \qquad (11)$$

Consequently, we obtain a condition for the family parameters generating the anti-symmetry of $\Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu)$ in the first two indices

$$\text{if} \quad 2\mu = \lambda+\nu \quad \longrightarrow \quad \Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;=\; -\Sigma^{acb}(\lambda,\mu,\nu). \qquad (12)$$

According to (11), no anti-symmetry of $\Sigma^{cab}(\lambda,\mu,\nu)$ exists, if the family parameters do not obey $(12)_1$.

[1] The semicolon denotes covariant derivatives, round brackets the symmetric part of a tensor, square brackets its anti-symmetric part.

3.2 Symmetrization procedure

Starting out with (5), we demand[2]

$$\Theta^{[ab]}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;=\; T^{[ab]} - \Sigma^{c[ab]}{}_{;c}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;\overset{\bullet}{=}\; 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\Theta^{ab}{}_{;a}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;=\; T^{ab}{}_{;a} - \Sigma^{cab}{}_{;c;a}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;\overset{\bullet}{=}\; 0, \tag{14}$$

generating a symmetric and divergence-free tensor Θ^{ab}. Consequently, we obtain from $(13)_2$ and (8)

$$T^{[ab]} \;=\; \Sigma^{c[ab]}{}_{;c}(\mu,\nu) \;=\; \mu S^{cab}{}_{;c} + \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c}. \tag{15}$$

and taking $(13)_2$, $(14)_2$ and (7) into account, (5) results in

$$\Theta^{ab}(\lambda) \;=\; T^{(ab)} - \Sigma^{c(ab)}{}_{;c}(\lambda) \;=\; T^{(ab)} - \lambda S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c}, \tag{16}$$

$$\Theta^{ab}{}_{;a}(\lambda) \;=\; 0 \;=\; T^{(ab)}{}_{;a} - \lambda S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a}. \tag{17}$$

3.3 Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations and curvature

A comparison of $(2)_{1,2}$ with (15) and (14) turns out that (14) becomes according to $(6)_3$ and (15)

$$T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; \Sigma^{cab}{}_{;c;a}(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \;=\; \Big[\mu S^{cab} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\nu)S^{abc} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda-\nu)S^{bac}\Big]_{;c;a}. \tag{18}$$

According to (2), (15) and (18) are Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations which change into the original ones, if the family parameters are

$$\lambda \;=\; 1, \qquad \mu \;=\; 1/2, \qquad \nu \;=\; 0. \tag{19}$$

This combination of the family parameters satisfies $(12)_1$ so that the anti-symmetry

$$\Sigma^{cab}(1,1/2,0) \;=\; -\Sigma^{acb}(1,1/2,0) \tag{20}$$

is valid in this case.

We now remember the

■ Proposition[3]: If Σ^{cab} is anti-symmetric in the first two indices

$$\Sigma^{cab}(2\mu-\nu,\mu,\nu) \;=\; -\Sigma^{acb}(2\mu-\nu,\mu,\nu) \tag{21}$$

according to (12), the second derivatives in (18) can be replaced by the curvature tensor R^b_{klm}

$$\begin{aligned} T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;&=\; \Sigma^{cab}{}_{;c;a}(2\mu-\nu,\mu,\nu) \;= \\ &=\; \Big[\mu S^{cab} + \mu S^{abc} + (\mu-\nu)S^{bac}\Big]_{;c;a} \;=\; -R^b_{klm}\Sigma^{k[lm]}(\mu,\nu). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

[2]The sign $\overset{\bullet}{=}$ stands for a setting.

This replacement is only possible, if (21) is valid, otherwise the second derivatives in (18) cannot be replaced by the curvature tensor. ■

Inserting (8), we obtain from (22) and (15) the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations

$$T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; -R^{b}_{klm}\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big), \qquad T^{[ab]} \;=\; \mu S^{cab}{}_{;c} + \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c}. \tag{23}$$

These Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations represent the energy-momentum balance equation $(23)_1$ and the spin balance equation $(23)_2$ which both are necessary for generating the symmetric and divergence-free tensor (16), if using (21) in (5). The curvature tensor $R^{b}{}_{klm}$ is determined by the space-time geometry which is choosed by a back-ground metric or by corresponding field equations[3]. The corresponding symmetric and divergence-free tensor (16) is according to $(12)_1$

$$\Theta^{ab}(2\mu - \nu) \;=\; T^{(ab)} - (2\mu - \nu)S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c}. \tag{24}$$

Choosing the parameters (19) results in the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations (2).

For generating the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations two facts are necessary: One has to know the relation between the anti-symmetric part of the energy-momentum tensor and the spin divergences $(23)_2$[4], and (21) has to be valid, because otherwise the curvature tensor cannot be introduced to the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equation $(23)_1$. Consequently, the applicability of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure depends on knowledge from the outside of the procedure: the scalars μ and ν have to be implemented by external facts, such as (19) which are Lagrangian-based.

We now consider the case for which the energy-momentum tensor itself is symmetric and divergence-free

$$T^{[ab]} \;=\; 0, \qquad T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; 0, \tag{25}$$

the case for which the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure is dispensible because the energy-momentum tensor itself satisfies the result of this procedure. According to $(25)_1$, (13) and (8), we obtain

$$\mu S^{cab}{}_{;c} + \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c} \;=\; 0, \tag{26}$$

and from $(25)_2$, (14) and $(6)_1$ follows by use of (26)

$$\Big[\mu S^{cab}{}_{;c} + \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c}\Big]_{;a} + \lambda S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a} \;=\; 0 \quad\longrightarrow\quad \lambda S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a} \;=\; 0. \tag{27}$$

If we demand that (26) and $(27)_2$ are valid for arbitrary (λ, μ, ν), the following conditions for the spin divergences

$$S^{cab}{}_{;c} \;=\; 0, \quad S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a} \;=\; 0, \quad S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c} \;=\; 0 \tag{28}$$

have to be satisfied for the validity of (25). According to (31), $(25)_1$ and $(27)_2$, we obtain the expected result

$$\Theta^{ab}(2\mu - \nu) \;=\; T^{ab} \tag{29}$$

that symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors are fix-points of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, even if the spin is different from zero. The special case of vanishing spin is included in (28).

[3]Especially here, we will choose Einstein's equations in sect.4

[4]a knowledge from outside the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure which establish the factor 1/2 in (1)

4 Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure and GRT

For the sequel, we now consider the case (12) which causes that the curvature tensor appears in the energy-momentum balance equation $(23)_1$ which is determined by the space-time geometry. Here, we are interested in the Riemannian space-time which is described by Einstein's equations

$$R^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}g^{ab}R \;=\; \kappa\Theta^{\dagger ab} \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \Theta^{\dagger ab} \;=\; \Theta^{\dagger ba}, \quad \Theta^{\dagger ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; 0 \tag{30}$$

(Ricci tensor R^{ab}, metric g^{ab}, curvature scalar R). We remind that the following proceeding is standard[5]: if the energy-momentum tensor is not symmetric[6] or not divergence-free[7], one has to generate a symmetric and divergence-free tensor (24) by use of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. This tensor serves as RHS of $(30)_1$

$$\Theta^{\dagger ab} \;\overset{\bullet}{\equiv}\; \Theta^{ab}(2\mu-\nu) \;=\; T^{(ab)} - (2\mu-\nu)S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c}. \tag{31}$$

The scalars μ and ν stem from the spin balance equation $(23)_2$ whose source is the anti-symmetric part of the energy-momentum tensor. According to the setting $(31)_1$, the two scalars fix the contribution of the spin to the source of Einstein's equations, that means, the spin's contribution to gravitation. Using Einstein's equations and the spin balance $(23)_2$, we obtain a representation of Einstein's equations

$$T^{ab} \;=\; \frac{1}{\kappa}\Big(R^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}g^{ab}R\Big) + \Big[\mu S^{cab} + \mu S^{abc} + (\mu-\nu)S^{bac}\Big]_{;c} \tag{32}$$

which is compatible with $(22)_2$ according to $(30)_3$.

The curvature tensor in the energy-momentum balance equation (23) has to be match with the metric g^{ab} in Einstein's equations $(30)_1$, that means, it has to obey the Bianchi identities as integrability conditions [7]

$$R^{b}{}_{klm;j} + R^{b}{}_{kmj;l} + R^{b}{}_{kjl;m} \;=\; 0. \tag{33}$$

Consequently, $(23)_1$ becomes with $j \equiv b$

$$\begin{aligned} T^{ab}{}_{;a;b} \;&=\; \Big[R^{b}{}_{kmb;l} + R^{b}{}_{kbl;m}\Big]\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big) - R^{b}{}_{klm}\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big)_{;b} = \\ &=\; \Big[-R_{km;l} + R_{kl;m}\Big]\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big) - R^{b}{}_{klm}\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big)_{;b}. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

In the next section, we investigate how the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure works with regard to GCCP.

[5] standard, but not evident

[6] e.g. that is the case, if the stress tensor of a material is not symmetric, for liquid crystals, spin materials [6] etc.

[7] if e.g. in General-Covariant Physics $T^{ab}{}_{;a} \neq 0$ is valid in general

5 GCCP and Belinfante/Rosenfeld Procedure

Usually, a Lagrange formalism is not available for General-Covariant Continuum Physics (GCCP). Consequently, we have to start out with the balance equations of energy-momentum and spin which are ad-hoc equations in the sense of a theory which is supported by a variational problem. In a curved space-time, these balance equations are [8]

$$T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; G^b + k^b, \quad T^{ab} \;\neq\; T^{ba}, \qquad S^{cab}{}_{;c} \;=\; H^{ab} + m^{ab}, \tag{35}$$

$$\text{with} \quad S^{cab} \;=\; -S^{cba}, \quad m^{ab} \;=\; -m^{ba}, \quad H^{ab} \;=\; -H^{ba}. \tag{36}$$

The G^b and H^{ab} are internal source terms –the *Geo-SMEC-terms* (Geometry-Spin-Momentum-Energy-Coupling) [8]– which are caused by the choice of a special space-time geometry and by a possible coupling between energy-momentum, spin and geometry. For non-isolated systems, $k^b \neq 0$ denotes an external force density, and $m^{ab} \neq 0$ is an external momentum density. In particular, one finds such a situation in special-relativistic continuum thermodynamics [9, 10, 11].

Inserting the balance equations (35), the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations (23) become

$$G^b + k^b \;=\; -R^b_{klm}\Big(\mu S^{klm} + \nu S^{[lm]k}\Big), \qquad T^{[ab]} \;=\; \mu\Big(H^{ab} + m^{ab}\Big) + \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c}. \tag{37}$$

The sources of the energy-momentum and spin balance equations (35) have to satisfy (37) for performing a modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. Because the source of the spin balance equation $(35)_3$ determines the anti-symmetric part of the energy-momentum tensor, we demand taking $(37)_2$ into account

$$H^{ab} + m^{ab} \;=\; 0 \quad \longrightarrow \quad T^{[ab]} \;=\; 0 \quad \longrightarrow \quad \nu S^{[ab]c}{}_{;c} \;=\; 0. \tag{38}$$

Because the spin is not restricted only by fact that we apply the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure with regard to GCCP, we satisfy $(38)_3$ by the setting

$$\nu \;\stackrel{\bullet}{=}\; 0 \tag{39}$$

which adapts the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure to GCCP. Consequently, the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations (37) result in

$$T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; G^b + k^b \;=\; -\mu R^b_{klm} S^{klm}, \qquad T^{[ab]} \;=\; \mu\Big(H^{ab} + m^{ab}\Big) \;=\; \mu S^{cab}{}_{;c}, \tag{40}$$

These equations are similar to those generated by the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure (2), if the balance equations of GCCP (35) are inserted. The derivation of (40) indicates that two conditions for the validity of (2) must hold: firstly the dependence of the anti-symmetric part of the energy-momentum tensor on the source of the spin balance equation represented by (39) and secondly that the factor 1/2 in (2) is introduced from knowledge beyond the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure[8].

[8]For all special models which we know up to now, $\mu = 1/2$ is valid, so that whith (39) and $(12)_1$ we come back to the usual covariant Belinfante procedure starting with (1).

From $(31)_2$ and $(30)_3$ follows

$$T^{(ab)}{}_{;a} \;=\; 2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a}. \tag{41}$$

Taking (40), $(35)_1$ and (41) into account, we obtain a differential equation for the spin

$$T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; T^{[ab]}{}_{;a} + T^{(ab)}{}_{;a} \;=\; -\mu R^{b}_{klm} S^{klm} \;=\; \mu\Big(H^{ab} + m^{ab}\Big)_{;a} + 2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a}, \tag{42}$$

$$S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c;a} \;=\; -\frac{1}{2} R^{b}_{klm} S^{klm} - \frac{1}{2}\Big(H^{ab} + m^{ab}\Big)_{;a}. \tag{43}$$

Here (43) is independent of the scalar μ. That is not the case for the Belinfante/Rosenfeld generated symmetric and divergence-free tensor (24)

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}\Big(R^{ab} - \frac{1}{2} g^{ab} R\Big) \;=\; \Theta^{ab}(2\mu) \;=\; T^{(ab)} - 2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c}. \tag{44}$$

Also in the special case of GCCP, (39), the contribution of the spin to gravitation is determined by knowledge from the outside of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. The same situation holds true for the general-covariant procedure which starts out with the definition (1) resulting in (19). The Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure itself cannot generate the symmetric and divergence-free "mutant" (44) of the energy-momentum tensor: the scalar μ has to be known in order to solve (43) and (44) together.

The complete formulation of GCCP contains beside the balance equations (35) those of particle number and entropy density[9]

$$N^{k}{}_{;k} \;=\; 0, \qquad S^{k}{}_{;k} \;=\; \sigma + \varphi \tag{45}$$

(N^k particle flux density, S^k entropy 4-vector, σ entropy production, φ entropy supply). The Second Law of Thermodynamics is taken into account by the demand that the entropy production has to be non-negative at each event and for arbitrary materials after having inserted the constitutive equations into the expression of the entropy production [14]

$$\sigma \;\geq\; 0. \tag{46}$$

Particle number and entropy density are here out of scope because the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure (4) does not touch particle number and entropy. That means, N^k and S^k do not influence gravitation concerning GRT.

6 Material, GCCP and Bel/Ros Procedure

We now presuppose that μ in (44) is known from the outside, so that the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure can be performed. Consequently, we consider three tensors in GCCP∩GRT

$$\Theta^{ab}(2\mu), \quad T^{ab}, \quad S^{cab}, \tag{47}$$

[9] For this continuum theory of irreversible processes, see [9, 12] and the contributions in [13].

the source of Einstein's equations (44), the energy-momentum tensor and the spin tensor satisfying the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations (40), the energy-momentum balance $(40)_1$ and the spin balance $(40)_2$. Because the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations are necessary for performing the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure [3], all energy-momentum balances and spin balances (35) whose sources do not satisfy (40) are not suitable for applying the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, and therefore also not suitable for a GRT description because a source of Einstein's equations cannot be generated.

If the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations (40) are satisfied, an energy-momentum "mutant" Θ^{ab}, (44), exists beyond the energy-momentum tensor T^{ab}, and the question arises, which tensor describes the constitutive properties of the considered system ? Evident is that in GCCP the in general non-symmetric and not divergence-free energy-momentum tensor T^{ab} whose (3+1)-decomposition is

$$T^{ab} \;=\; \frac{1}{c^4}eu^au^b + \frac{1}{c^2}u^ap^b + \frac{1}{c^2}q^au^b + t^{ab} \tag{48}$$

contains constitutive properties such as

$$\text{energy density:} \quad e \;=\; u_ku_lT^{(kl)}, \tag{49}$$

$$\text{momentum flux density:} \quad p^k \;=\; h^k_lu_mT^{ml}, \tag{50}$$

$$\text{energy flux density:} \quad q^k \;=\; h^k_lu_mT^{lm}, \tag{51}$$

$$\text{stress tensor:} \quad t^{kl} \;=\; h^k_ah^l_bT^{ab}. \tag{52}$$

Here u_k is the 4-velocity of the material and

$$h^i_k \;=\; \delta^i_k - \frac{1}{c^2}u^iu_k, \tag{53}$$

the projector perpendicular to the 4-velocities u^k resp. u_i.

Presupposing the special case that the source of the energy-momentum balance equation $(35)_1$ satisfies the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equation $(40)_1$, the RHS of Einstein's equations is (44) describing the constitutive influence of the material to gravitation. If $(40)_1$ is not valid, GCCP and GRT do not fit together. Clearly, real constitutive properties do not change by performing a formal Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. Consequently, it is evident that the energy-momentum tensor T^{ab} remains a carrier of constitutive properties also after having performed a Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure: a material equipped with a non-symmetric stress tensor (52) cannot be described by a symmetric $\Theta^{ab}(2\mu)$, (44).

There is one special case for which constitutive properties are transferred to the source of Einstein's equations, if T^{ab} is a fix-point of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure. Starting out with (44) and taking the fix-point property into account, we obtain by use of (41)

$$T^{(ab)} - 2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c} \;=\; \Theta^{ab}(2\mu) \;\doteq\; T^{ab} \;=\; T^{(ab)} + T^{[ab]}, \tag{54}$$

$$\longrightarrow \quad -2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c} \;=\; T^{[ab]} \;=\; 0 \quad\longrightarrow\quad T^{ab}{}_{;a} \;=\; 0. \tag{55}$$

The result is as expected: fix-points of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure are symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors. Consequently, the symmetric and

divergence-free "mutant" is in this case the energy-momentum tensor itself equipped with constitutive properties.

Summarizing, we have three different situations:
I: The Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equation $(40)_1$ is not satisfied. In this case, a GCCP-induced source of Einstein's equations cannot be generated.
II: If the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equation $(40)_1$ is valid, the source of Einstein's equations is (44) which is different from the energy-momentum tensor, the GCCP carrier of constitutive properties .
III: If the energy-momentum tensor is symmetric and divergence-free, the source of Einstein's equations is identical to this energy-momentum tensor, and the Belinfante procedure is dispensable.

Indisputable, the case III correspond to the demand of GRT that all constitutive properties are tied down to the source of Einstein's equations. This case points out that GRT is a special constitutive theory restricted to materials of symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors. Evident is, that in case I GCCP and GRT do not fit together: GCCP cannot be adapted to GRT. Really interesting is the case II: parts of the energy-momentum tensor are considered as non-generating gravitation. We obtain this part by the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure from (44) and $(40)_2$

$$T^{ab} - \Theta^{ab}(2\mu) \;=\; T^{[ab]} + 2\mu S^{(ab)c}{}_{;c} \;=\; \mu\Big[S^{cab} + S^{abc} + S^{bac}\Big]_{;c}. \tag{56}$$

Because the formal Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure does not change constitutive properties, these are still described by the in general non-symmetric and non-divergence-free energy-momentum tensor T^{ab}. If erroneously the constitutive properties in case II are bound up with the symmetric and divergence-free "mutant" $\Theta^{ab}(2\mu)$, the original material of GCCP is replaced by another one which now fit into GRT, but which is not the original one anymore. If one reject the fact of case II that constitutive properties and gravitational influence are described by different tensors, we obtain the following
■ Statement: Not accepting that two different tensors are necessary for describing space-time and constitutive properties, GCCP and GRT only fit together for special materials of symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensor. ■
This statement has two consequences:
A: Concerning GCCP, the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure is dispensable (case III).
B: A non-restricted general relativistic constitutive theory needs a theory of gravitation which accepts non-symmetric and non-divergence-free energy-momentum tensors (case I and II)[10].

7 Discussion

The energy-momentum and the spin balance equations of General-Covariant Continuum Physics (GCCP) include covariant derivatives which are determined by the space-time geometry. Either the space-time geometry is given or the balance equations have to be

[10] e.g. the Einstein-Cartan space-time

solved together with the field equations which determine the space-time geometry. The energy-momentum tensor of GCCP is in general non-symmetric and not divergence-free and is a carrier of constitutive properties such as energy density, energy flux density, momentum flux density and stress tensor.

If we are interested in the conditions under which GCCP and General Relativity Theory (GRT) fit together, the first well known problem arising is, that the source of Einstein's equations is a symmetric and divergence-free tensor. The usual tool for symmetrizing the energy-momentum tensor is the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure which generates a symmetric and divergence-free tensor which can be used as source of Einstein's equations [3].

The general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure uses an ad-hoc combination of spin divergences for achieving the symmetrization of the energy-momentum tensor. It was found out that only such energy-momentum tensors can be symmetrized which satisfy the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations [3]. That means, only those materials which satisfy the constraints implemented by the necessary Mathisson-Papapetrou equations can be described by GRT. Only for those materials, a symmetric and divergence-free "mutant" of the GCCP-energy-momentum tensor can be generated by the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure.

If the above mentioned ad-hoc combination of spin divergences is replaced by a more general family of spin divergences, Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations appear as necessary constraints for the Belinfante/Rosenfeld convertable energy-momentum tensors. These Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations decay into two classes: one class contains the curvature tensor, the other does not. Here, the first class is considered, because we are interested in the relation of GCCP and GRT. The introduction of the family of spin divergences demonstrates that there are symmetrization procedures beyond the conventional Belinfante/Rosenfeld proceeding. In any case, conventional or modified Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, the symmetrization needs some knowledge from the outside of the procedure, because otherwise the result of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld symmetrization is not unique.

As expected, symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors are fix-points of the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedures[11], even if the spin is different from zero. That is the only case for which the following problem does not appear: constitutive properties of GCCP are tied down to the coresponding non-symmetric and not divergence-free energy-momentum tensor of GCCP, whereas the properties of the space-time geometry are generated by the Belinfante/Rosenfeld-transformed "mutant". The formal Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure (4) does not transfer constitutive properties of the energy-momentum tensor to the source of Einstein's equations[12].

This splitting into two tensors, the material-dependent energy-momentum tensor and the Belinfante/Rosenfeld-transformed one determining the geometry contradicts the spirit of

[11] that means, a Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure is dispensable for such energy-momentum tensors

[12] e.g. if momentum flux density and energy flux density are different in GCCP, they become equal in GRT after having performed the Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure, implying a change to another material

GRT which demands that the source of Einstein's equations should contain all constitutive properties concerning the energy-momentum tensor. That is the case if both these tensors are equal, that means, the energy-momentum tensor is already symmetric and divergence-free and the symmetrization procedure is dispensable. Concerning GCCP, GRT is a theory which is restricted to the class of materials of symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors. Abolishing of this restriction makes an extension of the field equations beyond GRT necessary. A possible candidate for replacing GRT with regard to GCCP may be the Einstein-Cartan space-time geometry.

The question concerning the compatibility of GCCP and GRT can be answered as follows: as expected, the compatibility exists only for materials with symmetric and divergence-free energy-momentum tensors, but only if the above mentioned spirit of GRT is accepted.

Epilogue

In the special-relativistic Belinfante-Rosenfeld symmetrization procedure of a divergenceless non-symmetric energy-momentum tensor T^{ab}, the following ansatz

$$ {}^{\dagger}\Theta^{ab} \;:=\; T^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\Big[S^{cab} + S^{abc} + S^{bac}\Big]_{,c} \qquad (*) $$

is assumed. Here the antisymmetry of S^{cab} in the last two indices a and b guaranties that

$$ \Sigma^{cab} \;:=\; S^{cab} + S^{(ab)c} + S^{[ab]c} $$

is anti-symmetric in the first two indices c and a such that, due to the commutativity of partial derivatives, T^{ab} can be symmetrized by (*).

In the general-covariant derivation of the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations given in [3], the starting point is the symmetrization of a non-symmetric energy-momentum tensor, whose divergence does not vanish.To this end, the general-covariantly generalized ansatz (1) is assumed what, to some extend, is justified by the special- relativistic Belinfante-Rosenfeld procedure. But, the strategety of the present paper is the following: We do not refer to our knowledge of special relativity, but ask
(i) whether there are other general-covariant algebraic combinations of the tensor S^{cab} –now specified as the spin tensor of continuum physics according to $(35)_3$– which symmetrize T^{ab} and
(ii) how other combinations of the spin tensor modify the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations.
The result is that for the class of ansatzes (6), up to a factor μ, (1) is reproduced, if additional assumptions are made. This corroborates our knowledge from special relativity that only the symmetry properties of Σ^{cab} are relevant for the symmetrization procedure. While these properties are not changed by μ, the Mathisson-Papapetrou-like equations $(40)_2$ contain this arbitrary factor which has to be determined otherwise.

Acknowledgement My warm thanks to Prof.Dr. H.-H. v. Borzeszkowski, Institut für

Theoretische Physik, TU Berlin, for numerous helpful and sometimes controversial, but always friendly discussions on the meaning of the Mathisson-Papapetrou equations in the context with the general-covariant Belinfante/Rosenfeld procedure and the general-covariantly formulated Continuum Physics. Not to get lost of different points of view, we decided to add the epilogue.

References

[1] Belinfante, J.: On the current and the density of the electric charge, the energy, the linear momentum and the angular momentum of arbitrary fields. Physica 7 (1940) 449.

[2] Rosenfeld, L.: Sur le tenseur d'impulsion-energie. Mem. Acad. Roy. Belg 18(6) (1940).

[3] Muschik, W., v. Borzeszkowski, H.-H.: Mathisson-Papapetrou equations as conditions for the compatibility of General Relativity and Continuum Physics. Gen Relativ Gravit 46 (2014) 1677, arXiv:1304.3921v1 [gr-qc] 14 Apr 2013.

[4] Mathisson, M.: Die Mechanik des Materieteilchens in der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Z. Phys. 67 (1931) 826; Neue Mechanik materieller Systeme. Acta Phys. Polon. 6 (1937) 163. (See also, Golden Oldie. Gen Relativ Gravit 42 (2010) 985, with an Editorial Note by A. Trautman.)

[5] Papapetrou, A.: Spinning test particles in general relativity I. Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A 209 (1951) 248.

[6] Herrmann, H., Muschik, W., Rückner, G., v. Borzeszkowski, H.-H.: Spin axioms in different geometries of relativistic continuum physics, Foumdations of Physics 34 (2004) 1005-1021.

[7] Stephani, H.: General Relativity. Cambridge University Press 1982

[8] Muschik, W., v. Borzeszkowski, H.-H.: Entropy identity and equilibrium conditions in relativistic thermodynamics. Gen Relativ Gravit 41 (2009) 1285-1304.

[9] Neugebauer, G.: Relativistische Thermodynamik. Akademie-Verlag Berlin 1980.

[10] Eckart, C.: Thermodynamics of irreversible processes III. Phys. Rev. 58 (1940) 919.

[11] Israel,W., Steward,J.M.: Progress in relativisticthermodynamics and electrodynamics of continuous media. In: Held, A. (ed.) General Relativity and Gravitation, vol.2, p. 491. Plenum Press, New York 1997

[12] Kluitenberg,G.A., de Groot, S.R., Mazur, P.: Relativistic thermodynamics of irreversible processes I, II. Physica 689 (1953) 1071.

[13] Anile, A., Choquet-Bruhat, Y. (eds.): Relativistic Fluid Dynamics. Springer Berlin 1987

[14] Muschik, W., v. Borzeszkowski, H.-H.: Exploitation of the Dissipation Inequality in General Relativistic Continuum Thermodynamics. Arch Appl Mech 84 (2014) 1517-1531.